

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.3580 of 2016

Date of Decision.30.05.2016

Jaswinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Maninder Kaur

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. There is no scope for intervention in a case of direction for maintenance of ₹9000/- against husband who is working in a public sector undertaking and draws an income which is about ₹19,000/-. The contention is that the petitioner is interested in resuming company with his wife and he purchased a house by obtaining loan and he is also repaying a loan out of the salary which he is having. He will have great difficulty in paying the maintenance as granted by the court below.

2. The amount of ₹9000/- which is ordered to be paid to the wife and child is very modest for an employee in a public sector undertaking and I will find no cause for interference. If he is interested in settling the matter, the same proposals can be initiated before the trial Court and notice need not be issued to the respondent only for the purpose of examining whether the matter can be settled or not. That attitude will be displayed by the petitioner before the trial Court and trial Court will render every assistance

to secure an amicable settlement if it is possible between the parties.

3. The revision petition is dismissed but with the above observations.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 30, 2016
Pankaj*